

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

**LAUREN PAULSON,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**MATT ARBAUGH et al.,**  
Defendants.

No. 3:12-mc-00196-MO

OPINION AND ORDER

**MOSMAN, J.,**

On April 26, 2012, United States Bankruptcy Judge Randall L. Dunn issued his Report and Recommendation to the district court recommending [1-16] that I grant defendant Craig Russillo’s motion for summary judgment [1-1] and recommending [1-17] that I grant defendant Matthew Arbaugh’s motion for summary judgment [1-4]. Plaintiff objected [1-20]. Defendants filed a joint response [2].

**DISCUSSION**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(c)(1), a bankruptcy judge may hear a noncore proceeding that is “related to” a case under title 11. The bankruptcy judge will submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law to the district court. *Id.*; Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9033(a). A party may file “written objections which identify the specific proposed findings or conclusions objected to and state the grounds for such objection.” Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9033(b). An opposing party may

respond. *Id.* The district court is generally required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 157(c)(1). The district court “may accept, reject, or modify the proposed findings of fact or conclusions of law.” Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9033(d).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Dunn’s recommendations, and I ADOPT the Reports and Recommendations [1-16 and 1-17] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 18th day of October, 2012.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman  
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN  
United States District Judge